

R marks

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. New claims 21-48 have been added. Thus, claims 21-48 are in the application for consideration.

New claim 21 recites, among other things, interrupting the print job in response to receiving a selection (of one of the user-selectable printing features). The art of record fails to teach or suggest interrupting the print job in response to receiving a selection of one of the user-selectable printing features, in combination with the other features of claim 21. Claim 21 therefore distinguishes over the art of record. The Examiner admitted in the Office Action mailed June 13, 2003 for the parent application that the Chiarabini reference (EP 0,803,795) and other art of record did not teach interrupting the print job in response to receiving the selection. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable.

As claims 22-27 depend on claim 21, they too are allowable.

New claim 28 is an apparatus claim for an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code embodied therein, and recites, among other things, that the code is configured to interrupt the print job in response to receiving the selection. The art of record fails to teach or suggest code configured to interrupt the print job in response to receiving the selection, in combination with the other features of claim 28. Therefore, claim 28 is allowable.

As claims 29-34 depend on claim 28, they too are allowable.

New claim 35 is a control system claim. Claim 35 recites, among other things, processing circuitry configured to display, in the graphical user interface, a plurality of user-selectable printing features, in response to a command to execute a print job, to display a current status of the print job, to receive a selection of one of the user-selectable printing features, and to interrupt the print job in response to receiving the selection. The art of record fails to teach or suggest processing circuitry configured to interrupt the print job in response to receiving the selection, in combination with the other features of claim 35. Therefore, claim 35 is allowable.

As claims 36-40 depend on claim 35, they too are allowable.

New claim 41 recites a method of integrating print job status information and user options comprising displaying a list of a plurality of user-selectable printing features including a print status feature, with the status feature

being preselected to cause status information to be displayed, and displaying a current status of the print job proximate the list, in response to a command to execute a print job, wherein a printing feature other than print status can be selected from the list after the list is displayed. New claim 41 is similar to original claim 1 of the parent application, but has been reworded for increased clarity.

During prosecution of the parent application, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chiarabini reference (EP 0,803,795). Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that new claim 41 distinguishes over the Chiarabini reference for at least three reasons. First, the Chiarabini reference fails to teach or suggest displaying a list, as that term is commonly used. Second, the Chiarabini reference fails to teach or suggest preselecting a status feature from such a list. Further, the Chiarabini reference fails to teach or suggest displaying a current status of a print job proximate a list. While the Examiner may believe that it is known to provide a list together with status information, there is nothing in the prior art that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to provide these particular display items together. It would not be obvious to do so absent some teaching or suggestion in the prior art that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to provide status information proximate status features. By the time print status information is typically displayed, it would not be typical to change user-selectable features. A print job would typically have to be cancelled, if possible, by the time typical status information is shown, if a user desires to change any print features. The prior art teaches away from the invention defined by claim 41. Therefore, claim 41 is allowable.


As claims 42-48 depend on claim 41, they too are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of claims 21-48 is requested.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,
Kris R. Livingston

Dated: Dec. 29, 2003

By: 
Deepak Malhotra
Reg. No. 33,560